

hear how savagely the Republican budget cuts everything. The fact of the matter is that is a falsehood.

Student aid goes up 49 percent under the Republican plan, goes from \$24 billion to \$36 billion. But now we are hearing a new line. Now the line is that the Republican budget does not go far enough. If the gentleman from Hawaii would like to get into the debate and figure out a way to balance the budget plus handle it, \$1 trillion dollars, 7 years from now, if you say we are \$1 trillion short, I welcome him. Again I want to talk about Bosnia. But I will just say this with a footnote.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Will the gentleman kindly yield a moment.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Let me just finish this. Any plan you come up with if it goes even further than the Republican plan in making the savings that we are doing is going to have to add about \$750 billion to what your President and your party is willing to do.

I yield to the gentleman before going into Bosnia.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. That is very kind because I will focus on Bosnia. I realize what you are saying. Obviously if this moves forward we have to find more money to deal it. That is one of the problems with Bosnia.

My point is that there are alternatives. I will not take the gentleman's time tonight. It includes capital budgeting, and I do not consider it Republican or Democrat in that context. I am considering it in the context of America, the way the rest of American Government and business and families run their budgeting.

We separate capital budgeting from operating expenses and I think we can get to a balanced budget. We do not have to put a timetable right now but I would be happy to discuss with the gentleman and my good friend from Georgia ways that we can deal with honest numbers. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Hawaii. Certainly it has nothing to do with the Republican or Democratic Party. It has to do with being honest with budget figures. Obviously the Republicans in the early 1980's engaged in rosy scenarios just as Democrats have in the past.

But moving on to Bosnia, I know the gentleman from Hawaii certainly has some opinions on this which I look forward to hearing, also, I have just got to tell you. I hear so many people calling my offices, and I have answered a lot of the calls myself, and I have talked to other Members across the country.

The fact of the matter is, and I do not care what a CNN poll says, the overwhelming number of Americans today do not want United States men and women to put their lives on the line for a 500- or 600-year-old civil war in Bosnia. The fact of the matter is that we as a country appear to have learned a lot from the mistakes we made in Vietnam.

In fact, the Pentagon put forward a doctrine that would prevent us from getting involved in future conflicts that would lead into Vietnam-style quagmires. It was called the Weinberger doctrine. It came out in the mid 1980's, and it seemed to make a lot of sense. The first requirement was that before the President sent one young American to die in a war across the sea, he clearly stated a vital American interest that was at stake.

I have sat on the Committee on National Security for the past few months. I have heard testimony from the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, General Shalikashvili, and they have failed to come forward, and not them personally. They are representatives of the administration. The administration has failed to set forth a clear, vital American interest that is worth the spilling of blood of young American men and women to end a civil war that has been going on for 500 or 600 years, to end a civil war that is much more complex than even the conflict we got involved with Somalia.

Remember the need to go to Somalia because it was the right thing to do? We had to stop the hunger, we had to stop the clans from fighting each other.

The fact of the matter is, we went to Somalia, we spent \$3 billion, it cost us over 20 American lives, and today the warlords continue to fight each other. We did not make a difference in Somalia, and Somalia is nothing compared with what we go to when we start talking about sending troops to Bosnia. It makes absolutely no sense.

The President spoke a few nights ago and tried to define a vital interest, but unfortunately his vital interest had to do with securing a Bosnian peace treaty. The fact of the matter is that right now that Serbs in Sarajevo said they will fight to the death. I have got to tell my colleagues, until we clearly define a vital American interest that is worth the death of Americans, I respectfully have to reject the President's reasoning to send young Americans to Bosnia to die.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

BALANCED BUDGET DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of the aisle feel very passionately about their positions in the budget debate, and we should feel passionately about this issue because in fact what we are debating is the future of our country. The debate is

about far more than numbers. It really, in essence, is about the values and the priorities of the American people.

Democrats are concerned about the level of cuts that this budget makes in Medicare, in education, and in environmental protection. We believe that the cuts that are currently there, the cuts in this budget, go too far and too fast and will hurt too many people.

We are also very concerned about the tax package that is contained in this budget. Because of that tax package, we think that it is wrong to impose higher taxes on those who can least afford it while lowering the taxes on those who can in fact most afford it. That seems to have the priorities of this Nation out of whack.

We are not alone in thinking that the budget has its priorities upside down. If you take a look at what the American people are talking about, and there are recent surveys that have discussed this issue, the surveys indicate that 60 percent of the public today would like to see the President veto this budget as it currently stands.

I think that there are a number of us here who concur that that is what the President should do if Republicans refuse to lessen the blow on our seniors, our students, and on our environment.

Congress should not force its priorities on the American people. It is time to start to listen to them, to compromise on a balanced budget that protects the priorities of the American people. No one disagrees about getting our fiscal house in order, about achieving a balanced budget. There is a right way to do it and a wrong way to do it.

What we want to try to do is to protect those principles and those priorities that the American public has asked us, in fact, to protect. That means protecting educational opportunity, environmental protections, and it means protecting Medicare.

As it currently stands, the Republican budget, and this number has not budged in all these months, cuts \$270 billion from Medicare to help to finance a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. Over 50 percent of the tax cuts go to the richest 1 or 2 percent of the people in this country.

□ 1400

The cuts go too far too fast and will devastate a health care system that is serving 37 million seniors.

It is not only the seniors who are going to be hurt, and it is not just Democrats who are warning about the impact of the deep and the dangerous Medicare cuts. The most recent issue of Money magazine, there is an article. It tells families, actually, in the article, to hold on to their wallets because health care costs are going to go up if this budget passes. In fact, because of the cuts in Medicare payments to hospitals under this plan, administrators say that they will have to raise health care costs for the rest of the population in order to have to make up the difference.

According to a recent article in the New York Times, the Medicare cuts will shift more than \$11 billion in costs onto small businesses and American workers. That is because if people wind up having additional people wind up with not having insurance, once more, as our current situation indicates to us, that those people who are without insurance, if they do get health care, and they will, that those costs do not just fall into an abyss, into a vacuum. Those costs get picked up by all those who, in fact, are currently paying health care costs. We will just add to the number of those who are uninsured, and those additional costs will have to be borne by those who are currently picking up health care costs today.

That is a burden on individuals, and it is a burden on our businesses today and our workers that they simply cannot afford.

The GOP Medicare proposal is fundamentally flawed by controlling spending, but, by not controlling costs, it ensures seniors will be forced to pay more out of pocket while health care costs continue to rise. That would mean a giant step backward for America's seniors. That is not the way to balance the budget. That is not the American way.

CLAIMS VERSUS TRUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GANSKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, the last few months the congressional Democrats have tried to scare the American people, using all kinds of scare tactics and disinformation with twisted rhetoric.

I would like to point out to you a typical example of how wrong it is. First one Medicare, my golly, I just heard the story that this is gutting Medicare cuts, and the dangerous Medicare cuts, et cetera. Let us take a look because I would like to have the American people make their own judgment.

It seems like the argument is Medicare part B. Part B is to pay for a doctor's bills, et cetera, long-term care. The way it is right now, senior citizens pay about one-third, \$46.10. They cost Government three times more than that.

So what happens right now, one-third is paid by the senior citizens, two-thirds paid by the other taxpayers, younger generation. The other ones subsidize senior citizens by this ratio.

Take a look at this. Starting next year, our friends want to do this one-quarter paid by the senior citizens, three-quarters by the other taxpayers. We said "no" because in good time perhaps, maybe, but we do not have any money. We would like to keep it one-third, two-thirds relationship, continuing the next 7 years so we can balance the budget.

Where is the cut? This is what they call a cut. They would like to spend this much. We said "no." Let us main-

tain present situation. They call that a mean-spirited cut, deep cut, all kinds of rhetoric.

Now, even though maintaining this relationship, because hospital costs have gone up anyway, everybody has to pay a little more. Senior citizens have to pay a few bucks more a month, and their younger generation has to pay a few dollars more to subsidize.

Let us take a look at the next chart. Starting \$46.10 a month, eventually at the end of 7 years it is going to go up to \$87 a month. Mr. Clinton's plan is \$83 at the end of seventh year. Strangely enough, next year, did it to less payment, I do not know why, perhaps election year, then go up. Eventually we are talking about \$87 versus \$83. The American people knows this. That is what is the difference in the Part B premium than what the Republicans propose and what Mr. Clinton proposes. It is about the same.

Let us take a look at the next one. I mean, hearing this rhetoric that we are trying to put all of this poor working family out in the cold, they are talking about earned income tax credit. Many people do not know what is earned income tax credit. What it is, if you make money, you have a family, but not enough to support family, then Government pays you money. Look at what happens. This time, about this year, the Congress passed a law so you do not have to have children. Anybody can be eligible to receive the Government paychecks without having any children. That was different than original intent. Guess what happened here? Zoom, thousand percent increase.

What we are trying to do is slow down a little bit. The blue line here, slow down by eliminating waste and fraud, and also we are trying to go back to the original intent that if you do not have any kids, if you do not have any children, you are not going to receive any EITC paychecks anymore from Government. That is all we are trying to do.

Where is the cut? Where is the mean-spirited cut here?

Let us take a look at the next example. Next one is a lunch program, taking food away from the mouths of children. What a grotesque twist of rhetoric. Actually, we are spending more money, to be exact, 37 percent more, from \$4.5 billion in 1995 to \$6.17 billion in the year 2002. Is that the cut? 37-percent increase is a cut?

All we are trying to do is, there are so many programs right now, we are trying to consolidate into one program, also eliminate the middle man—in this case, Federal bureaucracy—so the local school district can get more money, in a sense, the children can get more money for their school lunch program. Tell me where the cut is.

Finally, now they are trying to scare students. My God, they say we are cutting student loans and other educational aid.

Let us take a look at this. Starting from 1995, continue going up at the end

of the seventh year the budget shows student loan, \$36.4 billion, 48-percent increase. The student gets 48-percent increase in student loans.

Is there a cut? I think we should stop this rhetoric.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SCHUMER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SIESTA FOR CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today we gain new insight into what this new Gingrich-ite majority meant when they said they would give us a new Congress, and we can see it right here on the floor today. They have brought an entirely new institution to this Congress, not new to other countries of the world. It is known as a siesta.

You see, at a little after 1 o'clock today, when most Americans were out working hard trying to make ends meet, the Gingrich-ite leadership declared a siesta in the Congress. They said at 1 o'clock, after they had paid to bring back Members of Congress from all of the 50 States to pass a bill this morning that could have been approved last night with ease, to suffer a major defeat today on a piece of legislation that would take money away from veterans' care, they said at 1 o'clock, "We do not have any more business today. We do not want to work any more." And unlike some of our friends in other countries in the world who might take a 2- or 3-hour siesta around noontime, this new Gingrich-ite majority proposes to extend its siesta until midnight and well into tomorrow.

It is as if they did not hear the message of the American people that I heard over the Thanksgiving break, a message that said, "Stop your antics. Get to work." The message that said, "We do not appreciate Speaker GINGRICH wasting somewhere between \$500 million and \$800 million, so zealous with his extremist agenda that he would pay Federal workers not to even work for a week, at the expense of the American taxpayer."

But instead of coming back to work and actually working through these appropriations bills, they declare a siesta.

And is there work left to be done? Well, indeed, if they had not been sleeping on the job or something, we would never have had a Government shutdown in the first place. You see, they had a responsibility to pass some 13 appropriations bills by September 30.

Did they do it? No. They passed 2 of 13, a failing grade where I come from down in Texas. Have they done it